

REMARKS

As shown in Fig. 17, independent claims 1 and 11 are directed to establishing a logical relationship among a plurality of peripherals, such as readers 604 a, b, n, headsets 602 a, b, n, beepers 606 a, b, n and printers 608 a, b, n via a wireless network managed by system manager 600. Fig. 18, likewise, discloses multiple peripherals 612-640 to be interconnected via a wireless network.

By contrast, U.S. Patent No. 5,563,402 to Reddersen discloses no wireless network, nor any plurality of peripherals to be interconnected via such a network. At best, as the Examiner indicated, a single electro-optical reader 310 in Fig. 14 of Reddersen is configured to work with a single host computer 340 by scanning a bar code symbol 335 on a cable 320. Not only is there no wireless network (nor could there be due to the presence of cable 320), but also, there are no other peripherals to be interconnected.

Fig. 15 of Reddersen discloses the configuring of an electro-optical reader 410 to a data terminal 440, or to a point-of-sale unit 450, or to a handheld unit 460. None of these peripherals are simultaneously interconnected together, and certainly not in a wireless network due to the presence of cable 420.

The Examiner relied on U.S. Patent No. 6,149,063 to Reynolds and held that it would be obvious to substitute the wireless link taught by Reynolds in the Reddersen system. First of all, this determination is contrary to Reddersen's disclosure. As the Examiner will note upon reviewing Reddersen, the presence of the cable is critical. Indeed, it is the presence of the code 135 on the cable 120 in Fig. 5, the code 175 on the cable 160 in Fig. 9, and the code 335 on the cable 320 in Fig. 14 of Reddersen which enables Reddersen to configure its single reader to another single device to

which it must be connected by a cable. To eliminate the cable renders Reddersen's system inoperative.

Neither Reynolds, nor Reddersen, discloses or suggests the presence of a plurality of readable, unique identifiers for multiple peripherals, nor the establishment of a logical relationship by a system manager among such peripherals in a wireless network.

The rejection of independent claim 17 over U.S. Patent No. 5,513,303 to Cargin is not well founded. Cargin does not disclose or suggest a background detector for converting environmental noise to a noise signal, nor any processing to remove the noise signal. Nevertheless, to expedite prosecution, claim 17 was amended to further recite that the background detector is supported by the user. This feature is not suggested by the prior art.

The rejection of independent claim 19 over Cargin should be reconsidered in view of the amendment that the biometric sensor is "on the trigger". This type of user authentication is not characteristic of the retina scan mentioned by the Examiner.

Allowance of claims 1-20 is respectfully requested.

Wherefore, a favorable action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

KIRSCHSTEIN, OTTINGER, ISRAEL & SCHIFFMILLER, P.C.

Attorneys for Applicant(s)

489 Fifth Avenue

New York, New York 10017-6105

Tel: (212) 697-3750

Fax: (212) 949-1690



Alan Israel

Reg. No. 27,564